

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 5, 2008.

At the outset, the undersigned wishes to thank Exr. Jean-Gilles for his time and courtesy during the recent telephone interview of June 9, 2008. As the Examiner will recall, agreement was reached to cancel claims 3-5, amend claim 20 to recite that the first server includes hardware and that the secondary reference to Maurya teaches to receive the requested data responsive to a single request. Therefore, the Examiner agreed with the undersigned that the applied anticipation rejection has been overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 3-5, 20, 21-33 and 36-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 3-5 are canceled herewith.

Claim 20 has been amended to positively recite that the first server includes hardware. Claims 21-33 and 36-38 were rejected as non-statutory as being dependent upon an allegedly non-statutory independent claim. As independent claim 20 has been amended into what the Examiner considers statutory form, the §101 rejections of dependent claims 21-33 and 36-38 are believed to be moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-33, and 36-38, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Maurya et al. (hereinafter “Maurya”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving, by a first server, a first request for content from the mobile device;

responsive to the first request for content, sending, by the first server, an address of the requested content in a reference format to the mobile device;

receiving, by a second server, a second request from the mobile device for the content subsequent to the first request for content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request specifying an address of the requested content and a type of the mobile device;

Kindly note that claim 1 requires two requests from the mobile device: i) a first request, received by the first server; and iii) a second request, received by the second server. Indeed, the first request is received by the first server and the second request (that is received subsequent to and that is different than the first request) is received by the second server. The first request is a request for content and the second request specifies an address of the requested content (received from the first server) and the type of mobile device.

As agreed to during the interview of June 9, 2008, Maurya does not teach any such method that includes first and second requests by a mobile device (called a handheld computer in Maurya). Indeed, Maurya teaches many different variations of his method (almost one per paragraph, starting at paragraph [0026]), but each such variation calls for the handheld computer to make a single request and to thereafter receive the requested content from the third party content software provider 150, 750/Web Portal 140, 740 /Content Source 130, 730/Wireless Server 180, 780 (Fig. 1, 7) and/or via the ISP 755 (Fig. 7). The variations define slight changes as to the sequence of events and who carries out the conversion/compression of the data to render it suitable for rendering on the handheld computer 160/760, and the flow of the requested content. But, in all cases, Maurya teaches that, responsive to a single request by the handheld

computer 160/760, the content is requested, obtained, converted or compressed and finally returned to the handheld computer 160/760. Therefore, to obtain content, the handheld computer 160/760 requests the content and, after a delay, obtains the requested content, suitably formatted, and without any further action.

In direct contrast, the claimed embodiment calls for steps of:

receiving, by a first server, a first request for content from the mobile device;

responsive to the first request for content, sending, by the first server, an address of the requested content in a reference format to the mobile device;

receiving, by a second server, a second request from the mobile device for the content subsequent to the first request for content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request specifying an address of the requested content and a type of the mobile device;

Maurya does not teach or suggest any such sequence of a first and a second request issued from a mobile device, nor does Maurya teach or suggest a first server receiving a first message from the mobile device and a second server receiving a second message from the mobile device, during a single transaction to deliver content to a mobile device, as claimed herein. Again, each variation of Maurya's methods calls for the handheld computer to make a single request and, after the requested content is obtained from the third party content software provider 150, 750/Web Portal 140, 740 /Content Source 130, 730/Wireless Server 180, 780 (Fig. 1, 7) and/or the ISP 755 (Fig. 7), receive the requested content, which is antithetical to the claimed embodiments herein.

Independent claim 20 also positively recites such *first and second requests* from a mobile device and servers that are configured to, responsive to receiving such first and second requests,

deliver the requested content to the mobile device. Indeed, as amended, independent claim 20 recites:

a first server that includes hardware and that is configured to deliver, responsive to a first request for content from the mobile device, an address of a content in a reference format responsive to a request for the content from the mobile device, and

a first proxy server configured to receive a second request from the mobile device for the content, the second request received from the mobile device being different from the first request received from the mobile device, the second request including the address of the requested content in the reference format and a type of the mobile device, to fetch the content at the received address responsive only the second request only, to convert the fetched content from the reference format to a format suitable to the type of mobile device and to deliver the converted content to the mobile device, wherein the first proxy server is configured to maintain a configuration table associating the type of mobile device with display characteristics of the mobile device and wherein the first proxy server is further configured to access the configuration table and convert the requested content to the format specified by the display characteristics associated with the type of the mobile device.

Maurya does not teach or suggest any such servers configured to receive such first and second requests from a mobile device, nor does the applied reference teach or suggest a first proxy server that is configured to fetch the content at the address received in the second request from the mobile device, as also agreed to during the recent telephone interview. Instead, Maurya's methods calls for the handheld computer to make a single request and, after the requested content is obtained from the third party content software provider 150, 750/Web Portal 140, 740 /Content Source 130, 730/Wireless Server 180, 780 (Fig. 1, 7) and/or the ISP 755 (Fig. 7), receive the requested content. Maurya simply does not teach or suggest servers as configured as recited in independent claim 20, as Maurya's method teaches that, *responsive to a single request from a handheld computer, the handheld computer receives the requested data*. In direct contrast, the present independent claim 20 requires the mobile device to send, and the first proxy server to receive, a second request for the content that includes the address of the requested

content (which was received from the first server responsive to a first request from the mobile device), which is taught only in the present application, and not the applied reference.

As the applied reference does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections applied to the claims are respectfully requested.

It is believed that the present application is now condition for allowance, as was agreed to during the telephone interview of June 9, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should Examiner Jean-Gilles have any further questions or concerns regarding this Amendment or the application in general, he need only call the undersigned, and whatever is needed will be done at once.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: June 25, 2008

By: _____

Alan W. Young
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,970

YOUNG LAW FIRM, P.C.
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106
Portola Valley, CA 94028
Tel.: (650) 851-7210
Fax: (650) 851-7232

C:\YLF\CLIENTS\ORCL\5769\5769 AMEND.9.doc